BEFORE THE BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGIST EXAMINERS FOR THE STATE OF ARIZONA

Case No. 15-15
) CONSENT AGREEMENT FOR DECREE OF CENSURE
)

On August 14, 2015, the Arizona Board of Psychologist Examiners ("Board") met in open session and discussed Case No. 15-15 regarding Leslie Donnelly, Ed.D. ("Licensee"). Dr. Donnelly and her attorney, Faren Akins, each addressed the Board and answered questions. After discussion, the Board voted to refer this case to an Informal Interview, and also voted to allow the Board's Assistant Attorney General, Jeanne Galvin, to enter into negotiations with Licensee's attorney in an effort to resolve this case by means of a Consent Agreement.

On October 7, 2015, the Arizona Board of Psychologist Examiners ("Board") met in open session and again discussed Case No. 15-15 regarding Licensee. Her attorney, Faren Akins, addressed the Board and answered questions. After discussion, the Board voted to table an Informal Interview in this matter, and also voted to allow the Board's Assistant Attorney General, Jeanne Galvin, to continue negotiations with Licensee's attorney in an effort to resolve this case by means of a Consent Agreement.

JURISDICTION

- 1. The Board is authorized to regulate the practice of psychology in Arizona pursuant to A.R.S. § 32-2061, et seq., and the rules promulgated thereunder, found in Arizona Arizona Administrative Code ("A..A.C." or "rules") at R4-26-101, et seq., to regulate and control the licensing of psychologists in the State of Arizona.
- 2. Licensee is the holder of license number 4537 for the practice of psychology in the State of Arizona.
- 3. The Board has personal and subject matter jurisdiction over Licensee pursuant to A.R.S. § 32-2061, et seq., and the rules at A.A.C. R4-26-101, et seq.

٠..

RECITALS

Licensee understands and agrees that:

- 4. The Board and Licensee enter into this Consent Agreement to promptly and judiciously resolve this matter, consistent with the public interest and the statutory requirements of the Board.
- 5. The Board has jurisdiction over Licensee and the subject matter pursuant to A.R.S. § 32-2061 *et seq.*, and the rules at A.A.C. R4-26-101, *et seq.*.
- 6. Licensee has the right to consult with an attorney prior to entering into this Consent Agreement.
- 7. Licensee has a right to a public hearing concerning this case. She further acknowledges that at such formal hearing she could present evidence and cross-examine witnesses. Licensee irrevocably waives her right to such a hearing.
- 8. Licensee irrevocably waives any right to rehearing or review or to any judicial review or any other appeal of this matter.
- 9. This Consent Agreement shall be subject to the approval by the Board and shall be effective only when signed by the Executive Director and accepted by the Board. In the event that the Board does not approve this Consent Agreement, it is withdrawn and shall be of no evidentiary value and shall not be relied upon nor introduced in any action by any party, except that the parties agree that should the Board reject this Consent Agreement and this case proceeds to hearing, Licensee shall assert no claim that the Board was prejudiced by its review and discussion of this document or any records relating thereto.
- 10. The Consent Agreement, once approved by the Board and signed by the Licensee, shall constitute a public record which may be disseminated as a formal action of the Board and shall be reported to the National Practitioner Data Bank.
- 11. Licensee voluntarily enters into this Consent Agreement for the purpose of avoiding the expense, uncertainty, and prolonged time involved in further administrative proceedings.

FINDINGS OF FACT

- 12. The Complaint opened by the Board on its own initiative in this case alleges that Dr. Donnelly provided inaccurate information to the Board in her June 21, 2014, application for licensure when she answered the following application question in the negative:
 - Q.#17. Are you currently under investigation for or have you been found guilty of violating a code of professional ethics or code of conduct by any professional organization or jurisdiction?
- 13. Dr. Donnelly, in fact, was under investigation with the Maryland Board of Examiners of Psychologists ("Maryland Board") at the time that Dr. Donnelly answered Question #17 (pursuant to a complaint opened against her on October 24, 2012). However, at the time of her Arizona licensure application dated June 21, 2014, Dr. Donnelly had not been found guilty of violating a code of professional ethics or code of conduct by any professional organization or jurisdiction.
- 14. Dr. Donnelly's inaccurate statement was clarified by her when she completed an Arizona licensing renewal application dated March 10, 2015, in which she answered "yes" to each of the following questions:
 - Q.#9. Since May 1, 2013, have you been or are you currently under investigation by any professional organization, health care institution or provider panel of which you are a member or on staff, or a regulatory board or agency (including the Arizona Board of psychologist Examiners) concerning ethical propriety or legality of your conduct?
 - Q.#10. Since May 1, 2013, have you been disciplined by any agency or regulatory board of any jurisdiction (including the Arizona Board of Psychologist Examiners), health care institution, provider panel or ethics panel for acts pertaining to your conduct as a psychologist or as a professional in another field? If yes, please attach a report those actions including the name and address of the disciplinary entity, the nature of the action, and a statement of the charges and findings.
- 15. Licensee maintains that she did not intentionally seek to mislead the Board through her answer to Question #17 of the initial application. Rather, she contends that she

misread the question in its totality and focused only on the second part of the question which was correctly answered in that she was not found guilty of violating a code of professional ethics or code of conduct by any professional organization or jurisdiction at the time of the application. Licensee admits that she was found guilty of unprofessional conduct by the Maryland Board per a consent order issued July 11, 2014.

- 16. Licensee pointed out that when the two parts of Question #17 from the initial licensure application were answered by her in her March 10, 2015, renewal application (Questions #9 and #10) she did answer accurately to each item.
- 17. Licensee denies specific intent to mislead the Board in how she answered Question #17 of her initial licensure application, but accepts that if this matter was pursued to ultimate adjudication that the Board believes there is sufficient evidence to support a finding of unprofessional conduct.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- 18. The conduct and circumstances described above may constitute unprofessional conduct pursuant to A.R.S. § 32-2061(15)(m) using fraud, misrepresentation, or deception to obtain or attempt to obtain a psychology license.
- 19. The conduct and circumstances described above constitutes unprofessional conduct pursuant A.R.S. § 32-2061(15)(n) unprofessional conduct in another jurisdiction that resulted in censure, probation or a civil penalty or in the denial, suspension, restriction or revocation of a certification or license to practice as a psychologist.

ORDER

Based upon the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, the parties agree as follows:

- 20. Licensee is hereby issued a Decree of Censure;
- 21. Licensee's license #4537 with the Arizona Board of Psychologist Examiners is hereby granted Inactive status.
- 22. The Arizona Board of Psychologist Examiners will transmit a letter to the Maryland Board notifying the Maryland Board of the disciplinary action taken in RFI 15-15

and the basis for the disciplinary action;

- 23. Licensee shall comply with all terms of the Consent Order currently in place with the Maryland Board in resolution of Maryland Board Case #2023-009 ("Maryland Consent Order");
- 24. Upon completion of the terms of the Maryland Consent Order, the Arizona Board of Psychologist Examiners be provided with a progress report from the Maryland Board addressing Licensee's compliance with the Maryland Consent Order;
- 25. Should Licensee seek reactivation of her Arizona license, the Arizona Board of Psychologist Examiners will review the facts and circumstances of Maryland Board Case #2023-009, as well as the facts and circumstances leading to the Consent Agreement in the current matter (RFI 15-15). The purpose of the Arizona Board's review will be to determine whether any additional Board actions (such as the establishment of probationary terms, practice monitor, etc.) are necessary to protect the health, welfare, and safety of Arizona citizens should the Arizona Board approve Licensee's request to activate her Arizona license.
- 26. **EFFECTIVE DATE**: Licensee understands that the foregoing Consent Agreement and Order shall not become effective unless and until adopted by the Board of Psychologist Examiners and executed on behalf of the Board. Any modification to this original document is ineffective and void unless mutually approved by the parties in writing.
- 27. <u>CONSIDERATION IN FUTURE ACTIONS</u>: Licensee understands that this Order, or any part thereof, may be considered in any future disciplinary action against her.
- 28. **FINAL RESOLUTION**: This Order constitutes a final resolution of this disciplinary matter but does not constitute a dismissal or resolution of other matters currently pending before the Board, if any, and does not constitute any waiver, expressed or implied, of the Board's statutory authority or jurisdiction regarding any other pending or future investigations, actions or proceedings. Further, this Order does not preclude any other agency, subdivision or officer of this State from instituting other civil or criminal proceedings with respect to the conduct that is the subject of this Order.
 - 29. <u>TIME</u>: Time is of the essence with regard to this Order.

1	
2	COPY mailed 4 to:
3	Faren Akins Akins Law Firm
4	7702 E. Doubletree Ranch Road, Ste. 300 Scottsdale, AZ 85258 COPY of the foregoing mailed by interagency All day of February, 2016, to: Jeanne M. Galvin, AAG
5	
6	
7	
8	Office of the Attorney General SGD /LES
9	1275 West Washington
10	Phoenix, Arizona 85007
11	12 10
12	By: poslulae
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	